



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,779	02/03/2009	Thomas Scherer	WUE-51	4949
26875	7590	08/12/2011	EXAMINER	
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP			DUKE, EMMANUEL E	
2700 CAREW TOWER				
441 VINE STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CINCINNATI, OH 45202			3784	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/12/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10/584,779	03 February 2009	SCHERER ET AL..	WUE-51

EXAMINER

EMMANUEL DUKE

ART UNIT PAPER

3784 20110803A

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Attached please find Allowability notice with coreection made to the Examiner's amendment section.

/Frantz F. Jules/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3784

/EMMANUEL DUKE/
Examiner, Art Unit 3784

EXAMINER'S COMMENTS

1. For applicant's information, the amendment to the specification, which removed the informality, overcomes the previous objection to the specification. Additionally, submitted Replacement Drawing sheet 2/9, including the designation of the Figures with the Prior Art legend, overcomes the previous objection to the Drawings; and amendment to claims 1, 3, 8, 12 and 14, which removed the informality, overcomes the previous objection to the claims. Finally, amendment to claim 1 which distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention, overcomes the previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. Further, the amendment to claims 1, 11 and 23, which removed the informality, overcomes the previous objection to the claims.

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

2. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with David Fitzgerald, Esq., Attorney of Record (Reg. No. 67,324) on 7/22/2011.

- Claim 1 has been amended and replaced by the following:
 - 1. (Currently Amended) A cooling system for the cooling of heat producing devices in an aircraft, comprising: a central cold producing device including at least two cooling machines working independently of each other, at least one cold consumer, and a cold conveyance system

which connects the cold producing device and the at least one cold consumer, the cold conveyance system including at least two independent cooling circuits, each of the at least two independent cooling circuits coupled to the cold producing device so as to supply ~~supplying~~ a cold carrier medium that has been cooled by the cold producing device to the at least one cold consumer and return ~~returning~~ the cold carrier medium from the at least one cold consumer to the cold producing device, whereby the at least two cooling machines are coupled in parallel to the cold conveyance system such that each of the at least two independent cooling circuits are thermally coupled to the at least two cooling machines; and wherein the at least two cooling machines use air outside of the pressure cabin of the aircraft as a heat sink in order to expel heat, and the warm extracted air is expelled outside of the pressure cabin.--

- Claim 4 has been canceled.

REASON FOR ALLOWANCE

3. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowable: The prior art of record when consider as a whole, alone or in combination, neither anticipates nor renders obvious: A cooling system for the cooling of heat producing devices in an aircraft, comprising: a central cold producing device including at least two cooling machines working independently of each other, whereby that at least two cooling machines are coupled in parallel to a cold conveyance system such that each of the a least two independent cooling circuits are thermally coupled to the at least cooling machines; and wherein the at least two cooling machines use air outside of the pressure cabin of the aircraft as a heat sink in order to expel heat, and the warm extracted air is expelled outside of the pressure cabin of instant claim 1.

Fischer et al. (US 5,513,500) teach a system for cooling food in an airplane. However, Fischer et al. '500 does not teach a central cold producing device including at least two cooling machines working independently of each other, whereby that at least two cooling machines are coupled in parallel to a cold conveyance system such that each of the a least two independent cooling circuits are thermally coupled to the at least cooling machines; and wherein the at least two cooling machines use air outside of the pressure cabin of the aircraft as a heat sink in order to expel heat, and the warm extracted air is expelled outside of the pressure cabin of instant claim 1.

Additional references that also fail to meet the bounds of the present invention's claims are as follows: Simadiris et al. (US PG Pub 2003/0042361 A1) teach a liquid gallery refrigeration system for cooling food carts for aircraft. However, Simadiris et al. '361 does not teach a central cold producing device including at least two cooling machines working independently of each other, whereby that at least two cooling machines are coupled in parallel to a cold conveyance system such that each of the a least two independent cooling circuits are thermally coupled to the at least cooling machines; and wherein the at least two cooling machines use air outside of the pressure cabin of the aircraft as a heat sink in order to expel heat, and the warm extracted air is expelled outside of the pressure cabin of instant claim 1.

Zywiak et al. (US PG Pub 2005/0076661 A1) teach an aircraft gallery chiller system. However, Zywiak et al. '661 does not teach a central cold producing device including at least two cooling machines working independently of each other, whereby that at least two cooling machines are coupled in parallel to a cold conveyance system such that each of the a least two independent cooling circuits are thermally coupled to the at least cooling machines; and wherein

the at least two cooling machines use air outside of the pressure cabin of the aircraft as a heat sink in order to expel heat, and the warm extracted air is expelled outside of the pressure cabin of instant claim 1.

Kull et al. (US 5,491,979) teach apparatus for cooling food stuffs, especially in an aircraft. However, Kull et al. '979 does not teach a central cold producing device including at least two cooling machines working independently of each other, whereby that at least two cooling machines are coupled in parallel to a cold conveyance system such that each of the at least two independent cooling circuits are thermally coupled to the at least cooling machines; and wherein the at least two cooling machines use air outside of the pressure cabin of the aircraft as a heat sink in order to expel heat, and the warm extracted air is expelled outside of the pressure cabin of instant claim 1.

Therefore, independents claim 1 with the depending claims therefrom are considered allowable.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EMMANUEL DUKE whose telephone number is (571)270-5290. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday; 8:00am - 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler or Frantz Jules can be reached on 571-272-4834 or 571-272-6681. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Frantz F. Jules/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3784

/EMMANUEL DUKE/
Examiner, Art Unit 3784
07/25/2011